

## Remarks

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 4 and canceled claim 5. As a result, claims 1-4 and 6-8 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the objections and rejections and reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

Claims 4-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Office asserts that claim 4 allegedly does not recite any physical hardware element and that the “checker” as recited by the claim can be construed as consisting entirely of software. Applicants have amended claim 4 to include “server.” Applicants assert that the term “server” to one having ordinary skill in the art inherently includes hardware components. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejection.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Butterworth et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0133656 A1), hereinafter “Butterworth” and in view of Lewontin (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0071419 A1), hereinafter “Lewontin.” Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection on the following grounds.

For example, with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office fails, *inter alia*, to show that the proposed combination of Butterworth

and Lewontin teach or suggest “determining the address of the web service is an old address by checking a list of outdated web services” as claimed therein.

Butterworth teaches that “if the target web service has gone down, [the agent will] redirect the request to a backup web service.” See Butterworth, paragraph [0058]. However, Butterworth fails to teach or suggest checking a list of outdated web services to determine if the address of the web service is an old address. Further, Applicants contend that claim 1 provides for “forwarding a second request from the client to the new address of said web service.” In contrast, Butterworth teaches directing the request to a different web service (i.e., a backup). Applicants contend that Lewontin fails to cure these deficiencies of Butterworth.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 1, and claims 2-3 and 7, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being unpatentable over Butterworth in view of Lewontin.

With respect to claim 4, Applicants submit that the Office fails, *inter alia*, to show that the proposed combination of Butterworth and Lewontin teaches or suggests a system for redirecting a request for a web service in a data transmission network that includes all the features claimed therein. For example, for reasons that should be clear from the discussion of the proposed combination of Butterworth and Lewontin above, Applicants submit that the proposed combination of Butterworth and Lewontin fails to teach or suggest the system of claim 4, including “checking a list of outdated web services” as claimed therein. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 4

and claims 6 and 8, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being unpatentable over the proposed combination of Butterworth and Lewontin.

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. These features have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Elaine Chi /

Elaine Chi  
Reg. No. 61,194

Dated: June 18, 2010

Hoffman Warnick LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, NY 12207  
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone  
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile